



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,235	07/31/2001	Richard J. Redpath	RSW920010132US1	5539

7590 09/07/2005
DUKE W. YEE, ESQ. YEE AND ASSOCIATES
4100 ALPHA ROAD, SUITE 1100
DALLAS, TX 75244

EXAMINER

SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,235

Applicant(s)

REDPATH, RICHARD J.

Examiner

Lamont M. Spooner

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/13/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments, page 24, para. 3 "Moser presents a means to translate between source and target languages using a linked alternative language that is not a natural language.", "Moser never mentions a short hand identification,does not suggest translation engines that are comprised of natural languages only."

The Examiner cannot concur. The applicant teaches, specification, page 11, lines 26-28, "...but an actual natural language or "spoken" language" as defining the intermediate language. Applicant's contention, pages 23-25 of the specification is that Moser does not disclose this, and teaches away from this. However, Moser et al. teaches, C.5.lines 6, 7 "Linked alternative languages (LAL) can take the form of fully *speokable* languages", this even by applicant's definition is taken as the intermediate natural language. Moser further teaches the applicant's invention as prior art, C.2.lines 39-45 "The idea was that some one language could be chosen into which all potential source languages might be automatically translated; then from that pivot-language, texts could be automatically generated into any target language, saving much effort in the design of systems. *There were those who suggested using a natural language for this purpose...*". It is the

Examiner's position that Moser utilizes intermediate natural language as the LAL as stated above.

In response to applicant's arguments, page 24, para. 3, "Moser never mentions a short hand identification,does not suggest translation engines that are comprised of natural languages only.", the Examiner fails to find these limitations in claim 7 as argued, and therefore these arguments are moot.

In response to applicant's arguments, p.23, para. 1, "LAL in the claimed invention is a method of marking the language and is not synonymous with the optimized language illustrated within Moser", the Examiner's position, as stated in the previous rejection is, "the intermediate text is annotated using a linguistic annotation language (figure 3D, his LAL *annotations*).", and not simply his LAL.

2. Applicant, p.8 of Remarks, has pointed to p.7.lines 10-21, and p.13.line 21- p.15.line 4 as support for amended claim 7. However, the Examiner fails to locate the support for the limitation, claim 7, line 18, 19 "wherein the linguistic annotation language is a mark-up language" and lines 4, 5 "wherein the option specifies use of a linguistic annotation language."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

Art Unit: 2654

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In claim 7, lines 18, 19 "wherein the linguistic annotation language is a mark-up language", and lines 4, 5 "wherein the option specifies use of a linguistic annotation language.", p.7.lines 10-21, and p.13.line 21-p.15.line 4 lack support for amended claim 7, on page 14, lines 18-21, "A provider may also register a chain of applications in properties 512 by establishing a name and associating the chain module to the name setting the chain module to that name setting the chain of applications to be chained using a chain option recognized by the chain module.", does not support amended claim 7, as indicated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-7, and 10-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moser (US 6,275,789).

As per claim 1, Moser et al teach a method for chaining a first translation engine and a second translation engine, comprising 9 figures 2a-2d):

Art Unit: 2654

receiving a request to translate a source text from a source natural language to a target natural language (Fig. 10 his "In: Swahili", his "out: Indonesian").

receiving, in the first translation engine, the source text in the source natural language; his source language (SL), (Fig. 2A-including his created LAL, as the first translation engine)

using the first translation engine to translate the source text into an intermediate text in an intermediate natural language (C.5.lines 6, 7 "Linked alternative languages (LAL) can take the form of fully *speokable* languages, interpreted as natural language) and to annotate the intermediate text; (figure 2b, his source language is translated to the Linked Alternative Language (LAL), figure 3D, his LAL annotations)

receiving, in the second translation engine (Fig. 2C- including his traditional MT), the annotated intermediate text; (figure 2c, his fully edited (annotated text in the LAL);

using the second translation engine to translate the annotated intermediate text into a target natural language (ibid, the use of the traditional MT to translate the LAL to a third language) to form a target text; and

returning the target text as a response to the request (Fig. 2c his output);

As per claim 2, Moser et al teach wherein the intermediate text is annotated using a linguistic annotation language (figure 3D, his LAL annotations).

As per claim 3, Moser et al teach wherein the linguistic annotation language is a markup language (his text formatting or HTML code that is used to annotate the text)

As per claim 4, Moser et al teach wherein the first translation engine and the second translation engine are chained using a chaining module (his translation engines)

As per claim 5, Moser et al teach wherein the first translation engine and the second translation engine are specified as options (the second translation that is used to translate the annotated LAL to the third language at figure 2c).

As per claim 6, wherein the options are defined in a properties file (figure 26, his database or instructions 26)

As per claim 7, Moser et al teach a method in a server computer, for chaining applications (figure 2a-2d), comprising:

receiving at a chaining module (ibid) a request from a requesting application for a service and an option associated with the chaining module; (a request for translation and use his chaining of the MT engine, one MT for translating the source language to Linked Alternative Language (LAL) and the other MT for translating from the LAL to a third language), wherein the option identifies the service by a service name and wherein the option specifies use of a linguistic annotation language (his selection of optimization criteria);

receiving a properties file, wherein the properties file associates the service name with a series of applications (figure 26, his database of instructions 26, Fig. 10. in Swahili, out Indonesian, display English as a series of applications);

receiving the series of applications corresponding to the chaining module, wherein the series of applications comprises a first translation engine (figures 2a, his translation engine that translates the source language to the Linked Alternative language (LAL)); and

a second translation engine;(figure 2c, his edited text in the LAL language is translated using traditional MT to a third language), wherein the first translation engine

Art Unit: 2654

translates from a source natural language to an intermediate natural language, and wherein the second translation engine translates from the intermediate natural language to a target natural language (Fig. 2a, 2c as above, his LAL as the natural language as explained in claim 1);

executing the first translation engine and the second translation engine in order and passing the output of the first translation engine to the input of the second translation engine, wherein the output of the first translation engine is annotated (figure 2a-2c, his use of a first translation engine to translate the source language to LAL language and the use of another translation engine to translate the edited (annotated) LAL language to a third language , see figure 3d for annotations and figure 16d, his annotate LAL text) with the linguistic annotation language and wherein the linguistic annotation language is a markup language (his text formatting or HTML code that is used to annotate the text); and

returning a result of the service to the requesting application (Fig. 2c-his output)

4. Claims 10-24 are the same in scope and content as claims 1-7 above and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lms
08/31/05


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER